UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Louis L. Mann, Curtis W. Reese, *Associate Editors*

The Amsterdam Congress Against War:

I. An Englishman's Impressions
By REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

II. An American's Impressions
By SYDNEY STRONG

III. A Declaration Against War
By ROMAIN ROLLAND

VOLUME CX NUMBER 3

Chicago, October 3, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

Unity Publishing Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*
Louis L. Mann, Curtis W. Reese, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
Mrs. S. O. Levinson, President
Mrs. E. L. Lobdell, Vice-President
Mrs. Francis Neilson, Treasurer
Mrs. Ella R. Nagely
Mrs. O. T. Knight
Mr. Irwin S. Rosenfels
Mr. C. W. Reese
Miss Matilda C. Schaff
Mrs. E. E. Smith
Mrs. Irwin S. Rosenfels
Mr. Francis Neilson
Secretary: May Johnson

Editorial Board
Edmund B. Chaffee
Zona Gale
A. Eustace Haydon
Jesse H. Holmes
Joseph Ernest McAfee
H. R. Mussey
M. C. Otto
Raymond H. Palmer
Alson H. Robinson
Clarence R. Skinner
Sydney Strong
Arthur L. Weatherly

Poetry Editors
Lucia Trent
Ralph Cheyney

Editorial Contributors
W. Waldemar W. Argow
Dorothy Walton Binder
Percy M. Dawson
James A. Fairley
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives
Australia—Charles Strong
Austria—Stefan Zweig
Bulgaria—P. M. Matthéeff
England—Harrison Brown
Fred Hankinson
Reginald Reynolds
Canada—Norman Stewart Dowd
France—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
Germany—Theodor Hahn
India—Rabindranath Tagore
Japan—Nobuichiro Imaoka
Palestine—Hans Kohn
Russia—Alina Huebsch

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 35
Unemployed College Graduates—Joseph Ernest McAfee 37
Jottings—J. H. H 39
ARTICLES—
The Amsterdam Congress Against War:
I. An Englishman's Impressions—Reginald A. Reynolds. 40
II. An American's Impressions—Sydney Strong 42
III. A Declaration Against War—Romain Rolland 44
Does Congress Represent Real India?—K. S. R 45
POETRY—
To Mahatma Gandhi—Etta Josephean Murfey 35
Trumpets on New Horizons:
Machinery—Lucy Wheeler Kegley 39
Drums—Francis Wierman 40
City Flotsam—Eliot White 40
CORRESPONDENCE—
Is Religious Liberty Dead in America?
I. Upton Sinclair 46
II. William B. Adams 47
III. Ernest M. Whitesmith 47
Drinking in America—Sydney Strong 47
Spiritual Values—Charles P. Kraft 47
THE FIELD—
India—A Public Meeting in Geneva—Margaret E. Cousins 34
Cruelty in India—*Alice Stone Blackwell* 48
National Religion and Labor Foundation 48

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

INDIA

A Public Meeting in Geneva

The presence in Geneva of a large number of people from various parts of the world for the Assembly of the League of Nations has been made the opportunity for the expression of public opinion of a world-wide character in support of the claims of the people of India to self-government and in support of a settlement of the Indian problem by a resumption of conferences and negotiations between Indian and British representatives on a footing of equality.

For this purpose a public meeting of an international and widely representative character will be held in Geneva in the second week of the Assembly, October 6th, that through it the world outside can be reminded that the peace of the world and the honor of two great nations, who are both members of the League, are concerned in the Indian crisis.

When 80,000 persons, including some of the finest men and women in the country, have been imprisoned in India, their destiny and the cause to which they have sacrificed their liberty cannot be considered the exclusive cause of either India or Britain.

Recent events bear signs of an earnest desire on the part of the peoples and governments of the world to take the necessary measures for the inauguration of peace, and the Indian problem must not be excluded from the scope of this attempt.

The aim of the meeting will be to be constructively helpful. The holding of such a meeting will enable a demand to be put forward that, as the settlement of international disputes by means of war should be made illegal, so also should the use of violence against non-violent upholders of a national cause not be continued. It will ask for the placing of the destiny of India in the hands of its own people in accordance with the pledges of Britain by the continued discussion of problems affecting the relations of the two countries so that an agreement by consent may be arrived at. It will also ask that non-violent political prisoners should not, as a matter of general universal principle, be treated as common criminals, and that as a consequence differential treatment may be accorded to the non-violent followers of Mahatma Gandhi who in their imprisonment are now being associated with criminals and forced to do hard labor. It will declare that the ethics of national governments should be brought into conformity with the international ethic of the renunciation of war.

The subject of Indian freedom is a matter of concern to the whole world as much as the Manchurian problem.

Margaret E. Cousins,
International Representative,
Women's Indian Association.
11 rue du Vieux College,
Geneva, Switzerland.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CX MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1932 Number 3

TO MAHATMA GANDHI

[On His 63rd Birthday, October 2, 1932]

You drink the cup of bitter years alone,
Uncowed, you meekly bear a king's decree.
Within confining walls of steel and stone
You undergo your dark Gethsemane.
No royal edict ever can efface
Your sunlit messages of faith and prayer
That warmed the aims of your resurgent race
And sanctified the years of chill despair.

Mahatma, sainted one, through word and creed
You spin the hopes of centuries today;
In starry vision you behold the need
Of India, to whom you show the way.
Though time has crushed your body, seared your soul,
Your spirit shall achieve a nation's goal.

ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY.

The arrival in this country of Mr. V. J. PATEL, of India, is an event of great importance. A former president of the All-India National Congress, a friend and recently a fellow-prisoner of Gandhi, one of the three or four oustanding leaders of the revolutionary movement in his country, Mr. Patel is one of the great men of modern India. Not since the late Lajpat Rai was in America a dozen years ago, has so distinctive and distinguished a representative of the Indian people in their present struggles for independence visited our shores. We met and consulted with Mr. Patel in London a year ago. He is a man somewhat older than the Mahatma, of most impressive dignity and carriage. His face bears the deep scars of his sufferings and sacrifices for the freedom of his native land, his voice the sober cadence of wisdom and high vision. His whole appearance is that of the sage and seer. But these are but the outward lineaments of a man who must be ranked today among the leading statesmen of the world. Mr. Patel of course knows India as only her own can know her. He is intimately familiar with the nationalist cause, and bears witness in his own person to the tyranny and persecution visited upon this cause by the desperate British government. The voice of this man is the voice of authority, to which all Americans should listen. For months this country has on the one side (the Indian side) been treated with a conspiracy of silence—while great events have been surging from end to end of the vast peninsula, not a word of news has been allowed to pass the censor! On the other side (the British side) the country has been drenched with propaganda, manufactured on the exact pattern of the Great War. Now comes a man from the scene of conflict, from the side of Gandhi, to tell to us the facts. His visit to America today is like that of Benjamin Franklin to France during the Revolutionary War, and it should be followed by the same results.

As one contemplates Gandhi's fast, one is stirred on the one hand by its consummate statesmanship, and moved on the other hand by its moral sublimity. As an act of leadership, it is by all odds the most terrific blow yet struck on behalf of the Indian people. In its inception, and as its immediate objective, the fast is Gandhi's supreme attempt to obtain justice for the "untouchables." The English, in their communal program, would segregate these helpless millions as an alien and despised class, and thus doom them forever to social outlawry—incidentally, also, sever them from the great body of Hindus and thus "divide and rule." The Mahatma, *per contra,* would keep the "untouchables" in the great body of the Hindu people, raising them at once to equal dignity and honor with all Indians, and incidentally keeping united the front against Great Britain. But Gandhi's heroic move spreads wider and penetrates deeper than this. His fast, as we explained last week, is like his earlier fast in 1924, at the time of the Hindu-Moslem rioting—a great act of penitence and appeal to all Indians to forget their differences and merge their purposes in the face of the common enemy. It is a declaration to all the world that unless Indian groups can agree upon a common program of independence, their cause is lost, and that if this cause is lost, life then for the true Indian is not worth the living. Lastly, the fast is a blow struck hard and straight at the power of English rule. Already it has opened Gandhi's prison door. Must it not likewise open at last the prison door of India? For if Gandhi lives, still more if Gandhi dies, this exalted gesture must arouse India to that final revolt which will achieve her liberty. What makes this threefold deed of statesmanship so potent is the heroic personal sacrifice with which it is suffused by the Mahatma's spirit. Here, in a way as simple as it is sublime, Gandhi lays down his life upon the altar of his nation's need. We stand on the threshold of one of

the supreme martyrdoms of history. To what devotion should we be moved, to be worthy of this man!

Few things seem to us to be more unfair than the current criticism of President Hoover in relation to the industrial depression. In saying this we are not intimating our belief that the man in the White House is any paragon of wisdom. We find no evidence of epoch-making statesmanship in his statements and policies. The President, in his general confusion, as well as in his patient steadfastness, seems to be curiously like all the rest of us. For this reason should we be slow to censure him, when we look in vain for anybody who could or would have done better in his place. Certainly, the present attack comes with bad grace from Mr. Roosevelt and the Democrats. As it happens, the New York Governor has held a political office, second only to the national presidency in power and influence, for exactly the same period of time the President has sat in the White House. The Empire State is the center of the nation's financial and industrial life. As head of this state since 1929, Mr. Roosevelt has had a peculiarly strategic opportunity to grapple with the vast problems of unemployment, relief, and general social reconstruction. But what has he done? Nothing, so far as we can see. The record of the President is far from wonderful, but as matched against the record of the Governor, it is a miracle of constructive statesmanship. The Democrats, also! —what have they been doing during these dreadful years, in the last of which they controlled the House of Representatives? Have the members of this party, in House and Senate, done anything, or proposed anything, to lead the nation to recovery? Senator Wagner need not be ashamed, but the party as a whole has been sterile in ideas and utterly unstable in policies. We have never known anything more futile than saving the nation by kicking Republicans out of office to let in Democrats. And never has this policy seemed to us quite so utterly futile as today.

German action in the matter of disarmament is aimed straight at what has become the one supreme objective of German life—the destruction of the Versailles Treaty! Political parties in the Reich may disagree on everything else, but they are in accord on this point. The people may have hopelessly divided loyalties, but they are all one in refusing to support any government which does not seek this end. So it makes no difference whether Bruening, Papen, or Hitler may be in office—the same international policy is to the fore. And of course the Germans are succeeding in their attack upon the Treaty. The Versailles document is a tissue of falsehood, injustice and sheer cruelty, and thus inevitably must crumble under the impact not only of German protest but also of the outraged conscience of mankind. Reparations were the first thing to go. Scaled down ineffectually first by Dawes and then by Young, they disappeared altogether at Lausanne. Now comes the assault upon the disarmament provisions of the Treaty, which strip Germany and give promise of Allied reductions which has never been fulfilled. The Reich now proposes either to build new armaments up to the level of the Allied forces, or else to have these latter forces immediately reduced to her low level. Which means one more enormous rip in the Versailles parchment! Meanwhile, of course, the campaign against the "war guilt" clause goes steadily on. It has already succeeded in convincing the scholars of the world that the clause is a lie. This revision of judgment on the part of historians must speedily be translated into action on the part of statesmen. Thus are the chains, forged upon the limbs of helpless Germany in 1919, one by one being broken and cast aside. The Reich has had no martial power to achieve justice. Her political and economic influence has been nil. In her utter weakness after the debacle, she has had nothing but an appeal to righteousness to aid her cause. And the appeal is winning out! When has there been a more impressive demonstration of the supreme potency of moral force?

The disappearance of Raymond Robins, like the kidnaping of the Lindbergh baby, is an event to chill the heart with fear. It is possible, of course, that Col. Robins has suffered from some strange accident, or is a victim of amnesia. But it is the consensus of informed opinion—the opinion of those who know him best—that he was a victim of "the underworld." For years he has been a militant Prohibitionist. Not content with leading the fight for the 18th Amendment, he has fought as well against the bootleggers with whom so many so-called respectable citizens have such friendly dealings. Threats of late have followed him wherever he has gone, and now apparently they have been made good. The merely human side of the tragedy is appalling, as it is heartbreaking. But added to this is the loss to the nation and the world. America had few public servants to match Raymond Robins for intellectual power, oratorical ability, executive capacity, and sheer idealism. His energy was indefatigable, his devotion absolute, his courage of the heroic mould. Utterly unselfish, asking no reward of money, office, or fame for his priceless labors, he moved in the highest political circles, was the intimate and influential friend of great leaders, and always, like Lincoln, knew the heart of the common people. His life was a romance of adventure. Miner, common laborer, gold-rusher to the Klondike, lawyer, settlement-worker, politician, publicist, reformer, he touched all classes of society and served all causes for the public good. His greatest hour was undoubtedly in Petro-

grad in 1917, when, as American commander of the Red Cross, he saw the passing of the old Russian regime and worked with Lenin for the establishment of the new. But details of a career, however wonderful, fade into insignificance before the bright memory of a personality. Who that ever saw it can forget that stern, intense, tremendous countenance, like the iron visage of an Indian chief? Who that ever heard it can forget that stream of passionate utterance, as eloquent in the private parlor as on the public platform? Who that ever felt it can forget that vibrant, untiring, enormous energy, throbbing like a superb engine in its precise and ceaseless motion? When shall we see this great man again? If never—where shall we find his like?

The rescue of the "Flying Family" of Hutchinsons from the ice-floes of Greenland may well be forgotten before this editorial is read in the rescue of some other individual or group forced down on sea or land in the latest mad adventure of the aeroplane. But this Hutchinson exploit was particularly reprehensible because it involved not merely a foolish woman but two helpless little girls, aged 8 and 6 years respectively. It would seem as though this gave occasion for the serious question as to how long this craze for stunt flying is to be allowed to go on. There is something about the sheer brazenness of these flyers which stirs our gall. Take the Hutchinsons, for example! They undertook a flight, involving the lives of eight persons, two of them children, which was charted through a region of snow and ice which had never been traversed safely. So hazardous was the undertaking that Greenland expressly forbade the "Flying Family" to land on her shores. But the Hutchinsons paid no attention—and were arrested and fined for their trouble. Then they went upon their way, and met disaster. Instantly they sent out a call for help, and straightway every ship within reach had to abandon its business, turn from its course, and hunt out the lost flyers in the wastes of a freezing sea. Nay, more!—every government in the vicinity had to send out special ships and aeroplanes on the dangerous search, all at heavy cost to taxpayers, and at serious risk to property and life. How much longer is this to continue? Can any fool aviator launch out on any kind of a fool stunt, and then expect the world to suspend its work, and shift its attention from serious things, when the inevitable smash-up or disappearance calls for rescue? It is our conviction that the time has come when the ban of the law should be placed upon these flights. Better still!—let the newspapers and "movies" quietly agree among themselves to stop forthwith their exploitation of them. With the publicity at an end, we'll wager the stunts would come to an end as well!

Unemployed College Graduates

Government statistics show that during 1930, and again more largely during 1931, the volume of migration from city to country exceeded that moving in the other direction. If this continues for a few more years and marks a definite social tendency, it will constitute an epoch in our history. The facts already recorded are more significant than if they merely indicated a return to abandoned agriculture. There is no need of more agriculturalists. Their numbers must rather continue to decrease relatively as the population increases. Some of these rural recruits are following the removal of factories from congested centers to the cheaper overhead of the village and small town. Others are getting away from high rents and stuffy apartments. They must find employment otherwise than in producing food.

One phase of the re-directed flux of life for which the depression is responsible is to be noted as of special significance. There is one element of the young life heretofore surging out of the country toward the city against whom the city is now thrusting forth specially formidable barriers. The colleges and universities have been and still are largely recruited from the towns and villages. These institutions pour out their graduates year after year, depression or no depression. For two or three years past cities have furnished employment for only a small fraction of these, whereas they were formerly enriched by practically all.

What are these recently graduated young people doing, and what will the new thousands to be graduated next year and the year following do when they are dismissed from the colleges and universities? Some are seeking more education, are "returning for graduate work." But there is an early limit to this possibility: support from the home resources will not hold out indefinitely. The recourse of the great majority of these unemployed graduates can only be to return to the old home in the village and town. What will they do there? What are those who have been forced back home already doing? A widespread investigation would be very illuminating.

It will likely be some time before the cities can again absorb so large a proportion of these youth as was formerly the case. Up to two or three years ago the tendency to discard the worker of 35 and 40, not to speak of those older, for the youngster of 19 and 22, was perfectly ruthless. It is not now so marked. The recklessness of such a policy is now recognized in quarters where it was commonly practiced. The urban

welcome to the alert, well-trained college graduate was formerly universal. He encounters barriers now which not only develop from the prevailing unemployment, but result also from the more secure tenure of the older workers in the positions which are available.

An eminent industrial leader was quoted the other day in severe criticism of the universities and colleges for turning out these graduates under present conditions. He declared that no classes should have been graduated this year at all. Which reveals his own and many another industrial leader's enlightenment upon our present economic and social problems. When the market for the product of his factory is glutted, he simply closes down his factory. He sees no reason why colleges and universities should not do the same thing when the "market" is unprepared to absorb their product. It is no wonder that we are in a bad way under such economic leadership.

Last June a young woman was graduated from one of our foremost colleges highly trained in English and in music. The way seemed clear before her. Like countless predecessors she would go to the city provided with introductions to influential friends and friends of friends, who would help her to find a place with some publishing house or in some other connection where her literary training would count. Her organ work would supplement the modest income to be at first expected from the main job. But with one accord these counselors raised hands and voices in shooing her back home. They told her to be thankful she had a home to return to. Some of them were themselves out of employment and others were daily expecting dismissal. Two days of that sort of counseling enabled her to see a light.

She went back home resolved to visit the editor of the paper in the nearest considerable town, call his attention to the recent general development of musical interest in the region, and the fact that he had been giving it no adequate recognition. Should he not start a musical department in his paper and put a competent reporter and critic in charge? She would likewise call upon the proprietor of the local book-shop, call his attention to the advantages of an efficient circulating department, and advise employing a competent manager for it. She would cease hunting for positions; she would create them.

If all of these graduates whom unemployment conditions in the cities have forced back into villages and small towns should follow the same course, what would happen to these communities which have been for two or more generations so notoriously weakened by the steady loss of their most aggressive young people? The imagination readily pictures a revolution.

Several years ago I visited a community located in a wooded region. Farmers and land-owners round about were making extensive cuttings of timber. On the hillside near the town a thrifty, uneducated German had built a small handle factory employing himself, his son and one other worker. He was thought to be doing well, even on that small scale. A sawmill was operating on the outskirts of the town, which some years made a little money and more often proved a problem for the local bankers who had originally financed it and had been compelled to take it over. For the rest, the timber was worked up into railroad ties. Hundreds of thousands of them were shipped out, oak and black walnut. A farmer would cut a tree on his place, hew out of the trunk one or two ties, load them on his wagon, haul them by team over terrible roads for five, ten, fifteen miles, unload them at the railroad siding and receive (at that time) one dollar for each of them. One load of 13 ties I saw hauled through town was exclusively black walnut. I counted a large pile at the track and found they ran ten per cent walnut and ninety per cent oak.

Suppose a bright young engineer had been forced back into that town under compulsion to find something to do. Would not such scandalous wastefulness have been promptly checked and the community's valuable and highly perishable wood resources been conserved to the great benefit of all concerns? There are thousands of American communities where resources are undeveloped or are being flagrantly ravaged. Vast wealth here awaits the eye of such experts as these young people have become under up-to-the-minute technical training.

The future of country banking, remains, I suppose, a question. Will the local bank be revivified, or will the chain banks take the rest of the territory which they have not already occupied? Similar question arises relative to retail merchandising in the village and town: will the chain store complete its conquest and squeeze out the small dealer everywhere? These highly trained young people, forced back home from college and technical schools, will probably study these questions. The long chances are that they will not decide them on such sentimental grounds as please to give "your own banker and dealer a chance to make a living." They will rather determine what program will serve the best good of the largest number and throw their energies into the support of that program.

In the fields of professional service and general culture the imagination readily builds up a new picture of the American community. The school is already far advanced in many sections. Commodious consolidated elementary schools and even high schools stand on the highways in the open country. In many towns the school building is the most impressive object on the landscape. But educational standards in all of them must go up and a higher grade of teacher be employed. These unemployed university graduates have an unlimited field in the schools.

There are said already to be doctors enough for one to each 783 of the population. But doctors are

scandalously distributed at present. Cities are alive with them while wide stretches of rural community and numbers of villages and towns are entirely devoid of professional medical service. The depression is likely to force the young doctors and trained nurses and other medical functionaries in the right direction, namely, toward the smaller towns and the open country.

Even the imagination falters when it comes to the law and legal practice. Who can redeem this profession and its field of service? The despairing observer is glad that these recruits are young. They will find reason for hope and will devise methods of reform even where the case seems hopeless to the seasoned observer.

In the field of religious organization the opportunity for reconstruction lies widest open of all. Among these trained young workers, forced back into the towns and villages, there will be few or no ministers from the conventional theological seminaries. But there will be trained social workers and graduates in the various social sciences. They cannot remain long in these smaller centers without recognizing the definitive importance of religious organization, and at the same time the impossibility of the prevailing denominational system. Indeed, as trained and practical sociologists will they not discover that the ecclesiastical order, with its ineradicable other-worldliness and divine-rightism, is a fatally inadequate instrument for the expression of the spiritual impulses of the people in our American society?

What will they do when some of these elemental discoveries are made, and the task of putting efficiency into the religious organization of their several communities is forced upon them? It will be interesting to watch them. A degree of originality will be required here which ought to call out the best in them and in their fundamental training. They will furnish a new type of religious leadership, and the social fabric produced will be something not less new. Please God!

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

Maine was in the direct line of the solar eclipse. The State was also in the direct line of the Republican eclipse.

The American Legion, at its recent convention at Portland, voted overwhelmingly in favor of the immediate payment of the "bonus." They followed this by voting for the repeal of the 18th Amendment. It looks as though the boys wanted money for the drinks!

What are the promises of nations worth? Nothing at all! If this dictum is doubted, we beg to cite the promise of the United States to grant independence to the Philippines, the promise of the Allies at Versailles to disarm, the promise of Japan as a signatory of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty to "renounce war as an instrument of national policy." If a nation would only keep its plighted word . . . but what is the use of supposing?

The Democratic National Committee is placing in the forefront of its campaign this fall a group of popular sports figures, headed by Gene Tunney, ex-pugilist. Thus do the politicians make their appeal to the intellect of this great republic!

Do men ever learn anything? Note this item in a personal letter recently received from a great American city:

". . . a little stock boom is on. A few days ago, one of my friends tipped me off to peek into a brokerage office. It was packed to the point of human sweat saturation; every pair of eyes glued on the stock-board figures; and, believe it or not, every now and then a chorus of cheers as a certain stock price advanced. By the latest improved almanac, October, 1929, wasn't quite three years ago."

Bernard Shaw has recently been accepted as a good insurance risk. Of course! But how about the rest of us who have to live with Shaw?

J. H. H.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Machinery

Why do the poets cavil
About an age of steel?
Brain hoists the brimming shovel,
Ambition turns the wheel.

With slow and sure precision,
The universe moves on;
A dynamo's decision
Of glory lights the sun.

I have seen men's golden bodies,
In nations of the east,
Bearing the market shoddies
No better than a beast.

I have seen great blocks of granite
Lifted by aching flesh;
Does God move star and planet
With human souls in mesh?

No longer the burdened hour
Bends Atlas, crushed by weight;
This globe revolves by power,
Love moves instead of hate.

Machinery—call it guessing—
That is not primed for greed,
Becomes man's richest blessing,
To serve his daily need.

LUCY WHEELER KEGLEY

Drums

Roll! Beat! Thump!
A crash!
And *That* awakes, drowsily answering
As down the street
Come marching men
To the thrill of drums,
A magic sound that eerily opens
Creaking doors of memory,
And, once the door is set ajar
Leaps the frail bonds of here and now—
In deep dark woods, in ages past,
The trees' low soughing at our back,
Beneath our feet the ground trod hard
To levelness, in countless rites
We swayed in time to beat of drums,
Our pulses leapt
As through the night the long roll sounded,
Cruel deeds, vile deeds seared
Jagged brands upon our hearts,
Frenzies of aimless braveries
Drove us to die exulting,
Crashes—as tortured prisoners
Doubled in death before a god
Of noise and blood,
We danced and howled, fell prone,
Wallowing, as roll, crash, battle rose
And high lone boom
Of war—
All this awakes when down the street
The drums call long and lustily
To *That*, within my blood!

FRANCIS WIERMAN

City Flotsam

Poor forlorn woman derelict of the city tides,
How did you muster courage to make your appeal at the church door?
But there was a young curate there, only a few months ordained, who hoped to have his new clerical attire mean more than a uniform—something of knightly gallantry and chivalric quest.
And your drifting to the gray Gothic portal on the twentieth century thoroughfare brought him a glimpse of Galilee long ago,
Where a woman shadowed holy feet with her hair, and bathed them with her tears and with ointment,
Hearing gracious words of forgiveness, and rejoicing in the light of a Face radiant with tenderness as noon with golden splendor . . .
So it did not matter though the scandalized guardian doorkeeper was sure you would steal the silver from the Rectory desk.
The boy clerical who had always wished for St. John the Beloved's chance to be with the Tender One, had his longing somehow fulfilled, when he brought you the pair of shoes you needed,
And you, sad, devastated wayfarer, said with strange wistfulness of gratitude illumining your buffeted face, and its tremor thrilling through your hoarse voice,
"You've treated me like Jesus Christ would have done!"

ELIOT WHITE

The Amsterdam Congress Against War

[UNITY was so fortunate as to be represented at the Amsterdam Congress by two of its staff correspondents—Mr. Reginald A. Reynolds, of England, and Dr. Sydney Strong, now of Geneva, Switzerland. Their impressions of the event were somewhat different. We present herewith their reports exactly as written and received. To these we append Romain Rolland's "Declaration" to the Congress, an original document of the first importance.—Editor.]

I. An Englishman's Impressions

Nobody had ever told me that Amsterdam is the most beautiful capital in the world, so I had the pleasure of discovering the fact for myself. It is certainly a gross injustice to Holland that one should form one's first impressions (as I did) from a railway-carriage window, en route for Hamburg. Holland is a triumph of human effort over Nature, and three days in Amsterdam have greatly increased my reverence for the artificial. Nature proved a generous rival, scattering sunshine on the broad white pavements. At night the canals were luminous with pools of reflected beauty.

To this place of cleanliness and order, austerely conceived and cunningly planned, there came the delegates of the Anti-War Congress. Forbidden at Geneva and Paris, the Congress was graciously permitted by the Dutch Government, with a mental reservation which took the form of a refusal of visas to the Russian delegation, including Maxim Gorky and other eminent intellectuals. This was not so serious in its effects as one might suppose, for Russia was represented by an overwhelming host of Communists from almost every other country. What the actual ratio was it would be difficult to say, but they accounted for quite 70 per cent of the British delegation. Several anti-militarist organizations had declined to be represented, refusing to credit the sincerity of Communist co-operation, and sceptical of the possibility of joint action with the Third International. Possibly the non-communist element lost more than the Communists by the absence of the Russian delegation. I have a well-founded suspicion that Communism becomes more realistic and less rhetorical as it approaches Moscow; and if so we should have found the Russians easier to work with.

I came by invitation of the Danish Committee and with the endorsement of the British *Friends of India*. I had one object, which I have kept before me throughout the Conference, and that was to press for immediate action against the wars actually being waged by British and Japanese imperialism. There can be only one excuse for the enormous expense of time and money involved in an international conference of 3,000 delegates; and that is the formation of a clear-cut project for effective international co-operation. But if this project is to have any value at all it must be directed not simply against future and hypothetical wars such as the impending attack of Russia, but here and now against wars actually in progress.

The fight against war must go on in every section of the line. Individually and through our various organizations we had clearly a duty that involved the whole struggle against capitalism and the root causes of international strife. But one question and one only seemed to my mind worth discussion at our conference—it was this immediate problem of action on the international front.

It is now the third and last day of the Congress. An hour ago I left the British delegation and wandered to a quiet seat by the roadside. As I went out the British Communist delegate Fergusson, with passionate facial contortions and a sort of windmill ges-

ticulation much in vogue at the Conference, was making the same speech to the British delegation I had heard him make at least three times before to the same audience, composed of the same mixture of truisms, platitudes, slogans, fallacies, mis-statements and rhetorical figures of speech that had been repeated for two and a half days from the rostrum and in every meeting of our delegation. From a distance, as I went out, I heard the applause: it was apparently to make speeches like this to one another that most of the delegates had come to the Conference.

In the meetings of the national groups one could at least hear what was said. The conference hall itself was a veritable tower of Babel. Hostile interruption was certainly rare, and confined itself to the internal dissensions of the Communist Party. The orthodox, of course, preserved their usual discipline among themselves, settling all disputes at the Communist "fractions," those Ecumenical Councils of the Leninist Church. The quarrel was between these and the Trotskyites, who on this occasion attended an international conference for the first time since their expulsion from the party. Even the C. P. discipline and an order to Communist delegates to give a fair hearing to the Trotskyites who spoke from the rostrum did not prevent loud and angry interruptions. On several occasions the Trotskyites, who numbered only about 10, retaliated by demonstrations against the spokesmen of orthodox Communism.

The main sources of confusion, however, arose from quite different causes. Speeches, especially on the first day, were of an intolerate length, and as few of them were comprehensible to more than one delegation—that to which the delegate speaking himself belonged—the noise of conversation frequently grew so loud that not even the speaker's own compatriots could hear what he said. There were several speeches of which I should doubt whether anyone except the speaker himself heard more than half. The crowding in the front of the hall and the intense heat (aggravated by glass skylights and an almost complete absence of ventilation) increased the general restlessness of the assembly. Some evidently thought differently; for on two occasions when particularly rhetorical Communists were about to speak the "Red Guard" saw fit to close all exits. By this means the small supply of oxygen was shut out, and all delegates in the hall forcibly subjected to a blast of hot air from the platform. In justice it must be admitted that most of the delegates appeared to appreciate this. The more the oratory of the speakers approached the standards of musical comedy Communism, the greater the applause. Such speeches were frequently punctuated by the *Internationale* and the "Rot Front" slogan, adopted universally from the German C. P.

The British delegation soon registered discontent and criticised strongly the conduct of the Conference. Some of us hoped this would mean a protest suggesting concrete proposals and asking for their immediate acceptance as a basis of discussion. I had been waiting my chance for this, and put forward an outline plan for an international organization to agitate among the workers, organizing and financing those engaged in the manufacture and transport of munitions in direct action. My conversations with British dockers handling war supplies for India had convinced me that this work was repulsive to many of them, who were aware that its purpose was the butchery of their fellow-workers. The revolutionary nuclei are already in existence among these workers. All they need is that outside support in organization and finance which will enable them to take action independently of the reactionary trade-union leaders. Here, I pointed out, our Congress with the innumerable organizations represented in it had its part to play. All available resources could be pooled and fresh funds raised by every means to support the struggle by all means in our power. Those of us who were not manual workers could find our place in this scheme along with the others as propagandists, speakers, journalists, collectors, etc., in the service of the organization, contributing ourselves every available cent towards the fighting fund.

I pressed this scheme continually, not as the only means of fighting war, but as a practical and immediate necessity which only such a gathering as ours was competent to promote. I readily accepted amendments and improvements suggested to my draft proposals and announced my willingness to give up the whole scheme in favor of any practical alternative which had more appeal to the delegation. None was forthcoming —only platitudes about the value of existing struggles and movements, many of these of very great importance, but national issues in themselves and irrelevant to the immediate issue of the existing wars.

After consideration by the full delegation, by a specially appointed committee and in innumerable personal conversations—after being redrafted and amended to meet every objection openly raised to it—after a promise of Danish support in seconding the resolution if moved by the British delegation—this scheme has been quietly dropped. It was quietly smothered and crowded out of the agenda till too late, and a member of the Communist Party admitted to me that this was done deliberately by the decision (in Camera) of the Communist "fraction" that has virtual control of the business of the delegation.

Instead we have had interminable torrents of Hyde Park oratory. The same members of the delegation who had protested against the rhetoric and "prize essays" delivered from the rostrum had no better alternative to offer than the limitation of the length of these speeches and a demand for more British speakers. This nationalist agitation was led by the Communists who rapidly produced a list of names without even considering what policy they were to advocate on behalf of the delegation. They were simply to tell the other delegates what we in Britain had been doing and what we were going to do!

This decided, subsequent meetings of the British delegation discussed the question of policy. The discussions were of the same order—rhetorical and irrelevant—and their purpose foredoomed by the secret decisions of the Communist "fractions." From yesterday evening discussion has raged around the manifesto prepared by Henri Barbusse. Some of the non-Communists, hopeless of any active policy, have since tended to withdraw from discussions, and I am frankly amongst them.

* * *

The Conference has now ended in one final blast of hot air. Looking back on it I feel I may have done it injustice. To many, if the applause meant anything, it must have been an inspiration. I confess to a feeling at least of strong personal friendship (if not of that working comradeship I hoped for) in relation to

most of those with whom I came in contact. I shall meet most of them again, perhaps in jail but not (I hope) at any committee. Meanwhile the one-sided war goes on in India, Japan mobilizes for further aggression, and Capitalism intensifies its campaign of anti-Russian propaganda that presages the war against the Soviet Union. . . .

I shall remember Amsterdam as a monument of culture and civilization—man's triumph over nature. The Conference I shall remember as human futility in face of a catastrophe overshadowing the world—War, the destroyer of culture, of civilization, of friendship and everything else in our world that is worth preserving.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

II. An American's Impressions

I have just returned from Amsterdam, where I spent three days in attending a World Congress against War. This involved a journey—two ways—over the glorious mountains of Switzerland: down and up the Rhine, for ages the political, social, ecclesiastical, industrial artery of Europe, where man has been most wideawake; across the placid plans of Holland. What a necklace of cities from Holland on the Sea to Switzerland in the Mountains—both lands during the War having maintained neutrality, to both their credit and profit—from Amsterdam to Geneva—Utrecht, Dusseldorf, Cologne, Bonn, Coblenz, Bingen, Wiesbaden, Worms, Heidelberg, Mayence, Basel and Lausanne.

"O, the pride of the German heart is this noble river!" So Longfellow wrote many years ago. Vine-clad hills, romantic castles, waterfalls, medicinal baths, scene of myriads of boats and steamers, with human and industrial freight.

Why this long journey? Three months ago there came by mail from Romain Rolland, who lives at Villeneuve, Switzerland, a circular letter, which was a clarion call by this famous author, summoning all lovers of peace and haters of war to assemble in a world congress.

> We summon all parties from whatever point of social compass they come, socialists, communists, syndicalists, anarchists, republicans of all shades, free-thinkers and Christians, non-partisans, all the associations of pacifists and war-resisters, conscientious objectors, independent individuals, everybody who is firmly resolved to put a stop to war. . . . We sound the alarm. We appeal to *all* peoples, *all* parties, *all* men and women of good will. . . . Salvation cannot be attained without the help of all. A truce to the discussions now rendering us. Unite against the common enemy! Down with war! Stop war! . . . We summon you to a great Congress against war!

I kept on the lookout for that Congress, for I'll go farther for a meeting to abolish war than to attend the Olympics. I heard that the Congress would be held in Geneva. Then I learned that the Congress would not be allowed in Geneva. If so, that is a great pity—for, it is the many voices of the people from many lands—real voices not merely on petitions, voices that are insistent, even demanding—that Geneva seriously lacks. Finally, I learned that the meeting would be held in Amsterdam. It was too long a way! Yet, it was that kind of a Congress that I needed for my enlightenment and inspiration. And, to Amsterdam I went—not knowing what I was to find save what I had read in the Rolland stirring appeal.

Rolland's appeal had been heeded. It was repeated up and down the lands through Henri Barbusse. And, on Saturday, August 27th they had gathered in the immense Exposition Palace, at Amsterdam—over 2200 of them, from "every point of social compass, Socialists, Communists, free-thinkers, Christians, war-resisters, conscientious objectors—everybody firmly resolved to "put an end to war." I had no idea when I looked over the great throng—there were many guests, members of the press, beside regular delegates—whether it was to be a Tower of Babel (with possibilities of scatteration) or a Pentecost (with many tongues and one spirit). Quite naturally, it proved to have elements of both. However, apart from outbursts against specific causes of war now and then, there was from the opening words by the chairman, Barbusse, to his closing words, one discernible purpose running throughout the Congress, namely: *One United Front against War.*

You realized this when you first went into the hall and looked at the raised platform for the speakers, where a couple of hundred were seated. You noted that there was a generous sprinkling of women. Beside Barbusse—who presided throughout—there were Miss Rolland (sister of Romain, who was too ill to attend), Patel of India, Katayama of Japan, Nexo, Mme. Duchene, H. W. L. Dana, Mme. Despard, Ben Marsh, Das Gupta, Sherwood Anderson, Munzenberg, Elizabeth Gilman, Scott Nearing, Reginald Bridgman Parkin.

At least a hundred speakers took part in the Congress—the speeches being simultaneously translated to Dutch, German, French, Italian, English groups, seated about the hall, in various places. Each speaker was striving to tell what should be done to *smother* war. The majority of them insisted that the causes of war must be uprooted. The majority also believe the great cause of war to be imperialistic capitalism. Whenever the Congress was stirred by this appeal, it was followed often by the audience standing and singing the Internationale. The socialists too have their ritual—and not to stand during the Internationale makes one feel as an Englishman feels when he sits during the singing of God Save the King.

It was apparent that a large number of the delegates were left-wing Socialists or Communists. I do not think this means that there was an attempt to "capture the Congress." It means that radicals are more alive to seize opportunities to scatter their ideas, and to bring about action. In fact, the element of daring was a feature of the Congress. It was daring for Rolland to send forth the call. It was a daring thing to make it a World Congress so suddenly, without "due preparations." It was daring to make a Congress, that sought *ways of action* for stopping war. It was daring to trust an assembly that might come up from the corners of the earth, and expect a united front. The wonder is that it was not more radical.

It would have been very easy for a quiet individual like myself, to have become scared at some of the roar, and slipped out and wandered down to the Rembrandt Gallery or strolled along the placid canals of the city, or taken the night train back to safe Geneva—but, I was hearing the voices of those who spoke for millions in many nations. And, if I am to *know* anything, I must know *all*, if possible. (I wished that the delegates to the Disarmament Conference were present; for there was here an abandon, a directness, an effort for concreteness and an absence of diplomatic circumlocution—so refreshing and promising of results.) Be it noted that this Congress of several thousand delegates met for only three days, and yet—in spite of the

fact of coming from many lands with many languages, they drove on to a conclusion, with certain specific recommendations for ending war. If there were the same purpose to end war the Disarmament Conference could come to a conclusion—even for providing for total disarmament—within three weeks! I do not commend Amsterdam, in many respects, but it can give Geneva points, and show that where *there is a will, there is a way.* In comparison with Amsterdam, the delegates to the Disarmament Conference move like dead men. It is no wonder that one of the best of American citizens wrote me that the people are "without faith not only, but are filled with resentment chiefly because of the deception that is being practiced upon the public."

The people who were in attendance on the Amsterdam Congress acted as if they were determined to stop war *before it came.* At first a kind of impatience was shown toward war resisters and conscientious objectors, as representing so much wasted energy and not effective in stopping war. But the radicals calmed down under the constant appeal to keep a united front, and it was put in the Resolutions that while the moral attitude of the C. O. and W. R. and any others who set themselves individually against the collective catastrophe was appreciated, yet "they called upon these to realize the uselessness of such sacrifice *after* the declaration of war, and to devote themselves *now* to a positive struggle to remove the causes of war."

There was a spirit of *refreshing immediacy.* Over the proceedings was the idea of an impending menace —a horror around the corner. The question was *what* is to be done *now?*

From the ceiling hung great streamers to give point to the necessity of immediate action. Now is the time for the people, all people, of all lands, to unite! These are some of the blazing slogans, that one could look at when unable to understand the speaker: *"Krieg dem Kriege"* "War against War"—*"Guerre à la Guerre"*—*"Hande weg von China"*—"Hands off China"—"Hands off Soviet Union"—"Down with Imperialism."

The World Congress was for *immediate action.* It also emphasized a *united front.* Some congresses, possessing a large staff of secretaries, might well take lessons in effective action. The greatest nonsense imaginable is the contention at Geneva regarding gradual disarmament, that total disarmament must be arrived at by easy stages. Hereafter, let our delegates at Geneva tell us that they do not propose to give us disarmament —but, let them not insult our intelligence by saying that the whole job of world disarmament cannot be done within a year. It can. The people know that it was done to the Central Powers—at least in good part, and in ninety days.

Here are some of the speakers with their ideas.

Barbusse. The intellectual and manual workers must unite against war. The attitude of big newspapers must be denounced. Capitalist politics and tariffs make the crisis, and crisis makes war. We protest against colonial wars. We arraign imperialism, French, British, Japanese, as provocative of war. We pledge ourselves to struggle against approaching war, and will strive to put our pledges into practice.

Patel, of India. Regretted that Gandhi could not be present. All India will be looking at this Congress. War is actually going on in India. He had come with high hopes to the Congress, but the Congress does not realize the gravity of the situation in India, which is now the center of a great war. Indians are compelled to carry on propaganda as a subject people. He called upon "the British section of the Congress to pronounce against the occupation of India," and for all to stop shipment of munitions into India.

Dana, of America said that the American delegation represented The Committee against War, with headquarters at 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City, who were seeking to mobilize public opinion, with the support of press and radio. We are going to struggle against war according to the solemn resolution this Congress has made. Workers should refuse to manufacture arms, which are destined to wipe out their brothers. It is also necessary to hinder transport. If the workers fight, it should be in defense of their fellow-workers.

Gorky sent a telegram refuting the assertion, that the Congress was "in the hands of Moscow." On the contrary, he said, there were "several hundred delegates from the ranks of the Second International."

Katayama, of Japan, made a deep impression when he said:

> I remember my first visit to Amsterdam twenty-eight years ago. I was a delegate of the Japanese Social Democracy to the Socialist Internationalist Congress. For me, that was the most striking moment of my life. That Congress was held in the middle of the Russo-Japanese War. At the opening session I sat in the Praesidium with all the old leaders of the Social Democracy, and I greeted in the name of the Japanese workers Plechanov, who represented the Russian workers. It was a solemnly moving spectacle of international proletarian solidarity. Rosa Luxemborg translated my speech into French and Clara Zetkin into German. The whole Congress rose in enthusiasm at this world-wide demonstration against war. . . . I stand here again today for the Japanese workers, and demand international proletarian solidarity for the struggle against war.

Sherwood Anderson, American writer, stated that there was a rapid approachment between writers and the working class. The writers should describe the situation and point to a better way out of the misery of human injustice.

And so, a *hundred* speakers, morning, afternoon and evening, voices from all lands, calling for a united front against war—mankind's greatest menace. And it must be done now, not tomorrow! Women spoke. A delegate from France, representing 300 war veterans of the Congress, demanded that there be no repetition of the indescribable horror of 1914. A trio of young men from the Far East, representing Japan, Korea and China, spoke together against war, in a manifesto —and were received with great acclaim. A young Italian navy man brought the vast throng to their feet for a song.

Meanwhile, committees on resolutions, etc., were busy day and night. Beside the tremendous outpouring of voice and soul against war, and expressing the necessity of a United Front, and that the workers of the world, as the worst sufferers in war, must act at every point to defeat the plans of war-mongers—plans were laid to carry on anti-war work, through national committees. An International Bureau, with headquarters in Paris, was also organized. It may be reached through Henri Barbusse, who remained Chairman of the Congress to the end, when he eloquently called again upon all to unite and mobilize with all strength against war-makers and war-profiteers. His address is: *Henri Barbusse, Aumont par Senlis, Oise, Paris.*

There were present 2,195 delegates from twenty-nine countries—1,865 workmen, 249 intellectuals, 72

peasants. As to party, there were 1,015 partyless, 830 Communists, 291 Social Democrats—and the rest in small groups. Resolutions against anti-Semitism, terrorism in specified countries aimed specially against the workers, were passed.

France played the leading part in the Congress. The two initiators, Rolland and Barbusse, are Frenchmen. From France there came 565 delegates, with Holland 478, Belgium 42, England 78, America 32, Italy 35, Germany 75, and so on down to Japan 4. The number of writers present was significant. Strolling through the adjoining hall, I saw a group of writers, over 100—and, from all parts, they were organizing to "write war out of existence."

It might be said that there was almost complete order throughout the Congress, except as might occur in the House of Commons or the U. S. Congress. There were no mobs inside or outside the Hall! I note that there was a riot at a similar meeting later in Paris. As to that I have no first-hand knowledge, for at that time I was riding up the right bank of the Rhine. It should be recalled that a peace-meeting sponsored by no less a Conservative than Robert Cecil and presided over by Mr. Herriot was turned into a bedlam by the "Paris mob," last November—and it was held in the Trocadero!

A public reception was held on Sunday night, attended by the people of Amsterdam, when 7,000 or 8,000 people came to show sympathy with the great Cause. This was attended with speeches, music, and conversation.

As I came away from hospitable Holland, which from the Mayflower Pilgrims on to the present has shown breadth of vision, I was asking myself, as I had asked several citizens, "How did Holland keep out of the War?" and on up the Rhine to Switzerland, where I asked, "How did Switzerland keep out of the War?" To these two sensible lands I take off my hat, because, while other nations were plunging into chaos, these two kept their heads on their shoulders, and remained neutral! Thank God for that! And what these two did, other nations can do! Sweden, Norway, Denmark also preserved neutrality! It is time to start an Honor-Roll of Neutral Nations—to give Nobel prizes to those lands that keep the peace, while their quarrelsome neighbors are "doing murder."

c/o American Express SYDNEY STRONG.
Geneva, Switzerland.

III. A Declaration Against War*

(Read at the First Session of the World Congress of Anti-War Societies)

To all those who have responded to our call, in spite of thousands of obstacles and troubles, we extend our brotherly greetings and our warm thanks. Let us on this day which brings us together avoid all words which would tend to disunite us, and put aside all grievances. Let us only voice our regrets for the error of those who have tried in advance to distort the great significance of a mass uprising of a people of the universe, coming from all nations, in order to establish the basis of a universal federation against War.

Men look with fear at this great wave which has risen from the bottom of the ocean of humanity. Those in the governments who have an interest to "divide in order to rule," have tried through the press to poison public opinion against our Congress. On the other hand, more than one of these leaders of the great political parties became frightened at what seemed to them an attack upon their administrative routine. They have seen sinister machinations in our efforts to constitute a "united front" against war, and these very words, "united front," have at present become distorted, and have lost the vital significance of the great revolutionary periods, because of red tape and idle talk—these glorious words have become a scare-crow.

Let us dare to take these words up again! And permit the man who was branded during the War with the title, *"Au-dessus de la Melee"* ("Above the Battle") to unfurl this great banner of "Above All Parties," "United Front," and to make it wave on the threshold of this Congress by giving them all their true, frank and loyal meaning.

We have come under this banner—an army of men and women from all quarters of the earth—to declare peace and to impose it upon the world. And this army is made up of very diverse elements. We all have our own doctrines and our own party tactics. We do not question these here. In our campaign of today whose precise aim is "War against War!"—what matters to us are not the uniforms of our confederates. We have only to consider their frankness, their fearlessness, their absolute devotion to the great cause which units us. Those who will prove to be the most energetic in the combat, those who will be ready for the most ardent sacrifices to destroy the common enemy, whoever they be, we shall follow them. We shall reject only the cowards, the faint-hearted deceivers who are satisfied with declamations which are never put into action, or are contradicted by action; all those who seek, without admitting it, pretexts for not acting. We have seen too many abdications, too much compromise, since the end of the last war. The peoples, exhausted by the bloodshed of the four years of murder, have allowed their powers to slip into the hands of dictators and bosses. It is urgent that they take back these powers, and that they recall their existence to those who have wellnigh forgotten it, and to those who speak in their name without taking the trouble of consulting them.

Our Congress is an awakening of the conscience of the peoples of the world, represented by the most daring and most active elements, who have felt and affirm their common aspirations, their will to cooperate against all that which is bent upon separating them and upon using them for self-destruction in the capitalist battles and in the bloody games of politics—against war and against those who make a business of it—against all imperialism. This awakening of the conscience is a call to arms. War against war! Now for the roll-call! Now for action!

Each of us, each party, brings its own arms, its own tactics. Let us mass them! Let us try to coordinate all sincere devotions. In the general movement there is room for many individual actions, provided that all converge in the same direction. The conscientious objection to military service weakens the stronghold of the same enemy which the armies of the proletariat are going to attack in battle formation. The battle of the masses does not exclude the parallel utilization of individual energy. An army whose battle fronts extend over all the world, ought, while coordinating its general movement, to admit that each front may have its own liberty of action. The form of action on each front depends upon the opposing tactics of the enemy.

In Germany, right after the *coup-d'etat* of Hitler,

*Translated by André Paul.

and in the Fascist countries, it is evident that the danger is greater, the risks more worthy of commendation, in rising against the sinister forces of nationalistic demagogues, who are the offspring of misery and despair, cynically exploited by the Reaction. As for us Frenchmen—we must above all control and hold in check our money powers, our big businesses, our great captains of industry, who are the secret or recognized masters of politics, until such time when we can destroy them. We must oppose their crooked imperialistic enterprises for enslaving Europe with their mercenary armies, and exploitation of colonial races. The Anglo-Saxons of Europe have to liquidate the heavy heritage of their domineering empire, accustomed to live on the tributes of their annexed colonies, and who today see their satellites detaching themselves, leaving them alone to carry a social burden to which they are unaccustomed. The social crisis now takes and in the future will take particularly brutal forms in the United States, where the European chaos and its antagonisms have found a surrounding exceedingly favorable to the spread of their contagions. The double pressure of the exploited masses, and of the spirit which stifles under a sky the air of which has never been purified by the free criticism of our Erasmuses and of our Voltaires must inevitably bring about an explosion, as well as the awakening of the other great races of the two Americas over which Yankee and Britannic imperialisms are contesting.

Asia is a tremendous powder-magazine, ready to explode from all sides. India pursues with its own weapons of *Satyagraha,* its silent, invincible fight for liberation. While the gigantic body of China, tied down by foreign imperialisms and their domestic accomplices, is raising herself heroically from a world of suffering. In the chaos of all these battles a single great people—more than a people, twenty peoples—a world—has realized and is realizing from day to day the building up of the proletarian State of U. S. S. R., the very existence of which is a defiance to the old exploiting world, a hope and an example for all the exploited peoples. Their common duty, and our duty as well, is to preserve this state against all the menaces of the united imperialist nations.

From all this entanglement of individual battles we must attempt to disengage the general lines to be followed in a common and coordinated action. And we must not remain satisfied, in these three or four days of meeting, to achieve an accord of sentiment and ideas (as important and as difficult as this first result may already be). We must not separate before having established a permanent active international movement against all the risks of the war which smoulders everywhere under the ashes. This permanent movement ought to be founded upon a close union of the two great bodies of confederated workers: those who are called the intellectuals, and the manual workers. In my capacity as an intellectual I deem it essential to denounce and condemn here the harmful and stupid pride, which the leaders of the large ruling class know only too well how to exploit even to this day, and which tends to separate the so-called *élite* from the masses, as under a caste system. As if the *élite* could exist without the masses, as if without the latter the intellectuals could defend their own existence, as if they were capable, in conflicts where the fate of humanity is at stake, to accomplish the least thing without leaning upon the armies of the workers who are the very mainspring of all action! Let us not hesitate to state it: Action is the goal of thought. Any thought which has not that aim is a treason and a failure. Therefore, if we are the servants of thought, we also ought to be servants of action. And we should seal the union of intellectuals worthy of that name with those who are the very substance of action, living action: the working people.

Our last word, as the first in this Congress, must be "Action!" Let us organize it in this great Congress, and in its more specialized professional and trade congresses of doctors, teachers, workers, etc., which will be held within the framework of this Congress. Each group will have to study its own appropriate form of action which it can and ought to exercise in its own domain. We will have to examine all together the most efficient way of breaking the backbone of war by striking it at the decisive moment at its very source of profits and death, its ammunition factories and its means of transportation. Future war is in the hands of the working people. They have the power to stifle it. And our role is to recall this fact to the working people and to share equally responsibility with them. The salvation of the world is the prize.

ROMAIN ROLLAND.

Amsterdam, August 27, 1932.

Does Congress Represent Real India?

One reads over and over again in various organs of the Continental as well as the American Press (not to speak of the British Press, of course), that the Indian National Congress has been successfully put down by Britain's firm rule during the past few months. Even Mr. Churchill seems to be satisfied that the present policy of the Government of India is satisfactory in its results. The situation in the country is said to be well under control in every Government Communique—in spite of thousands and thousands (over 40,000 since the struggle started in January) being in prison, and hundreds of other men and women joining their compatriots in prison day by day. But even apart from that, I wonder by what reason and argument it can be stated that the Congress movement is losing ground, and that the Government is fully master of the situation in the country, if it is still considered necessary to keep on a regime of Ordinances and Emergency Powers! In my opinion, a Government that has to forbid Mr. Gandhi's picture being exhibited in a shop, or had to decree (for a time) that the Mahatma's gramophone record on the nature of Truth is to be censored, cannot feel very secure.

There are, however, other and more significant signs for anyone who goes through the country and has eyes to see in an unprejudiced way. While it is true that only a few hundred delegates succeeded in reaching Delhi at the end of last month to hold the 47th session of the Indian Congress, it is also true that the strength of the Congress is no longer dependent on the number of delegates who attend the annual session. In fact, a great many of the men and women who are entrusted with the real work cannot afford to leave their places to attend the Congress session. It is

when we look into the every day life of the people, irrespective of caste, creed, age, sex, education (or illiteracy), that we begin to realize that the spirit of the Congress is no more a lip-service creed, but has taken root in the very soul and the bones of the people. There is not a village in India that does not know of the present political struggle, or does not fully sympathize with Mahatma Gandhi. The people may and do live in extreme poverty, but even in the most primitive mud hut one finds cheap prints of the portraits of national leaders. On every piece of cloth, however cheap or costly it may be, whether it is a turban, a *sari,* or a *dhoti* (a garment worn by men) one finds the picture of either Mahatma Gandhi, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Mrs. Kamala Chattopadhyaya or any other National leader as a trade mark. Various articles available and popular in the market like tooth-paste, soaps, perfumery, hair-oils, writing pads are given the names of Congress leaders, like Nehru Tooth Paste, Subhas Chandra Bose writing pad, etc. Let us go one step further. India is a deeply religious country. Most of the songs sung in the streets by the people have a religious meaning, depicting some incident in the life of religious teachers or giving the meaning of their teachings. We now find that along with those songs, there are others describing Mahatma Gandhi's march to Dandi two years ago to make salt, his being imprisoned and sitting behind prison bars. In some Provinces, we find that accounts of the present political struggle have been put to music, and are being sung along with religious songs at festivals. Can a movement that has sunk so deeply into the masses of the people be put down by "a firm hand"? The "firm hand" probably does not reach more than the outer manifestations of the struggle. Furthermore, can any Government consider itself to be master of the situation in a country of 350 million people, the majority of whom have been awakened to the necessity for shaking off foreign rule? It is surprising to see how the public in Great Britain, Europe and America has been led to believe by press propaganda that the Congress represents only a comparatively small percentage of Indian political opinion.

The real and dominant fact is that the bulk of the Indian masses stand in their sympathies solidly behind the organized band of workers whose political creed is that of the Indian Congress. There is in India today but one political party that counts and has the support of poor and rich, young and old—as even Lord Willingdon, the Viceroy, admitted in a public speech on the eve of the struggle.

Above, I have given some instances to show how the Congress creed has become part of the every day life, and, in some parts of India, even part of the religious practices of the Indian people. Let me show now another aspect of the life of the Nation, and perhaps the most important one at that—the younger generation. I have seen children of the age of 5 and 6 refuse to wear clothes made of foreign material, and some who refuse to wear anything but *khaddar* (homespun) because their parents have gone to jail for it. I have seen children refuse to sit in a class and read their lessons, because the teacher was wearing a *sari* of foreign material, and they argued with her that she could not be a teacher in a school if she did not even know that she should wear Indian-made cloth. I may mention here that the schools in which these incidents took place are strictly non-political; but is it possible in the India of today to shut out National or political feeling if one opens the gates of the school to let in students of all ages, whatever one's educational conviction may be as to whether politics should have a place in an educational institute or not? The Congress creed has become more than a political conviction with the people, it has become a part of their ethics, as it were. Were it otherwise possible that children, going through a fair, as I have seen them do, looking with longing eyes to purchase some toys, would abstain from purchasing them after making sure that they were of British make? By chance, I happened to know that these very same children were the grandchildren of a member of the liberal party, and thus came by no means out of a Congress environment.

Can any Government, I wonder, pretend or profess to put down a movement which has taken root in every branch of a nation's life by dispersing crowds and imprisoning very many thousands of people, when the so-called mute millions are awakening to the desire to be free and the babies suck it with their mothers' milk? The sons and daughters of those very same prisoners, whom the Government has removed out of the way, will carry on the fight, not only for the sake of the cause but also with the added fervor of revenge and thus with increasing strength and perseverance. Even if the Government did succeed—which is doubtful—in putting down the movement for the present, it will only rise again with a new determination. No Government can ever lay hands on the growing and fervent aspirations of millions of people who, moreover, have been trained to sacrifice for thousands of years, and think little of sacrificing everything including their lives to fight for their freedom, to which end the Indian Congress lends itself as a potent means.

K. S. R.*

*The pseudonym of a woman of great importance in India, who conceals her identity for reasons all too obvious under present conditions there.—Editors.

Correspondence

"Is Religious Liberty Dead in America?"

I

Editor of UNITY:

I read with some surprise Dr. Holmes' letter on the subject of the death of religious freedom in the United States. I thought I understood in a general way what religious freedom means, but Dr. Holmes gives me a new idea. It is not enough that Catholics should have the right to practice their religion and to share in all the privileges of citizenship, which the laws and solemn decrees of their church repudiate as unholy and destructive things. It appears that Catholics also have the right to have one of their members elected president of the United States, even though the vast majority of the American voters do not want him.*

I can only express my wonder whether Dr. Holmes has ever studied the encyclicals of the Pope bearing on the heresy which they call "Americanism." How any American who has studied these documents can feel that a mental

[*Hardly! Mr. Sinclair confuses the right to be elected with the right not to be rejected because of religious affiliations. Our editorial insisted, in accordance with the ideals of America, that a presidential candidate should be elected *or rejected* on his own merits or demerits, with religion his own and not the nation's business.—EDITOR.]

slave of such a system is fit to represent the United States and carry on its dealings with the outside world — that passes my comprehension. I put on record my hope that neither Dr. Holmes nor I may live to see the American people so far lose their senses as to let a Catholic become president of the United States, until the Catholic machine has abandoned its stand in favor of autocracy, religious, industrial and political.

UPTON SINCLAIR.

Pasadena, California.

II

Editor of UNITY:

I have just read an editorial in the August number of UNITY bearing your name, wherein you assume to champion the cause of Al Smith and papal paganism. This "attempt" at defense of religious liberty is simply ridiculous and is a clear indication of mental blindness if not mental degeneracy.

It may be that you are wiser than the rest of mankind who are capable of discerning the evils and dangers of papal machination—including noted historians and scholars. However that may be, the editorial to which I refer certainly shows lack of knowledge of the history and purposes of the papacy, if not a depth of stupidity in not comprehending the workings of a system so glaringly carried on in almost every large city in the land and at the seat of government at Washington.

Such sophistry as that contained in the editorial referred to may do for "dumb-bells" but it will not appeal to thinking people, as most of the readers of your journal appear to be.

WM. B. ADAMS.

Washington, D. C.

III

Editor of UNITY:

I have just finished reading your quite amazing article on what you consider the triumph of religious bigotry in the Democratic convention.

You very strangely confuse the support of a person's right to be a candidate with one's duty to support that candidacy. One may cheerfully defend a Catholic's or a Communist's right to become a candidate for the presidency, and yet vigorously oppose him for election on the grounds that a Communist or a Catholic ought not to be elected. You display the same "bigotry" in the matter of prohibition, and in opposition to any member of Tammany Hall. Is not opposition to one label as bad as another?

You also fail to see that everywhere throughout the world religion is being recognized as Thomas Carlyle saw it—"the chief fact of a man or a people." It determines one's attitude towards all the affairs of life. It may be called a synthesis of all one's attitudes and principles. On that account there are very few liberals, yourself included, who would support an out-and-out Fundamentalist for the presidency. We would conclude that the very fact that a candidate was a Fundamentalist was evidence of the fact that he did not have the type of mind that fitted him to deal with the problems of the hour.

We see also that some religions, more than others, tend to set men apart from the rest of their fellow-men, and they are those religions that profess to speak authoritatively on matters that concern our every-day affairs. Christian Science is one of such religions. It exercises an autocratic control over its members. It has expelled from its ranks those who dared to claim the right of conscientious objection to serving in the war, and, in various other ways, it dictates the outlook of its members.

You do not seem to recognize that it is very much easier to determine a Catholic's attitude on a great number of the urgent questions of our day than it is that of a member of a Protestant church. In most Protestant and Liberal churches the official pronouncement of the church on any question is not considered binding upon the individual member. It is otherwise with the Catholic church. The ex cathedra utterances of that church are made a test of one's Catholicism; and those utterances cover a wide and most important range of subjects, including private property, religious freedom, Socialism, public education, divorce, birth-control and a number of others of little less importance. Indeed so important are those pronouncements that in countries in which the rank and file of Catholics are much less loyal than they are in the United States, Catholics have felt that their position is so distinctive that they can function best through a distinctive Catholic political party.

It would not be wise, neither would it be much of a compliment to a Christian Science candidate, to vote for him for the position of head of the public health department, on the grounds that he did not take his religion at all seriously. I wonder whether it is much of a compliment to Alfred E. Smith to imply that his profession of Catholicism is lacking in sincerity. If he be sincere, can you have any question of the right and duty of an honest Protestant Southerner to oppose his candidacy for the presidency?

ERNEST M. WHITESMITH.

Eugene, Oregon.

EDITORIAL NOTE: A reading of these and other similar letters startles us into a realization that our editorial was truer and more necessary than we had actually imagined. We now discover that not only a Catholic, but a Christian Scientist, and a Communist must not be elected president. We are getting on!—EDITOR.

Drinking in America

Editor of UNITY:

Mary B. Dain's courteous comment on my Prohibition editorial of some weeks ago in UNITY, calls for a few words. It was in regard to seeing no drunken men while crossing the continent twice. This statement also included my friend Judge Griffiths. Of course, I was asleep half the time, being in Pullman! But, 50% of the time, I was rather wideawake. I stopped in Chicago a couple of days. Judge Griffiths, once chief of police of Seattle, and I exchanged observations while we were in New York, these observations agreeing. May I add, that I have spent a couple of years in New York, and my eyesight for "drunks" is not untrained.

Undoubtedly, there is much, tragically too much, drinking in America. I feel certain however that conditions are manifold better than before Prohibition.

The same mail that brought UNITY, with Mary B. Dain's comment, also brought a letter from a girl-schoolmate, of many, many years ago, in Seville, Ohio. She wrote, "Do you remember Professor McCoy, who used to pound the desk and shout, *Girls, listen! Never marry a man that drinks!*" This after several of the boys had imbibed too freely. I recall a morning when I went in the backyard to pick up hickory-nuts, when a man came running down the sidewalk, yelling, 'They are going to kill me!' It frightened me so, that I ran in the house, where I was told, 'That is ———! He has delirium tremens!' That sight was enough to make me abhor the saloon and all that goes with it."

Nearly every village used to have stupid topers and wandering maniacs, with delirium tremens. What patriotic American is anxious to grow another harvest of thistles and thorns?

At least two things will happen if Prohibition is repealed and drunkenness be sanctioned by law. First, from all over the earth—from France, from Britain, from Italy, from Canada, from Japan—will come an army of drink-locusts, with their wares, such as has not been seen since the days of drunken Noah. And, these will be more terrible than bombing air-planes. Even now, these enemies of sobriety are making ready for the invasion—waiting for the signal from King Gambrinus. Second, there will be a debauchery of advertising, on bill-boards, in movies, in press—everywhere in the heavens above and the earth beneath—that will make "Lucky Strike" look like a pigmy, inviting young and old to drink and be merry.

From all this debauchery and corruption may the second, sober thoughts of American citizens deliver us!

SYDNEY STRONG

Geneva, Switzerland

Spiritual Values

Editor of UNITY:

Believing that spiritual values come from an ethical handling of material things—so handled until there is a love to do justly, I think there are too many stones instead of fish handed out to the needy. Loan money to the farmer so we will not have to pay him a decent price. Reduce wages to increase dividends to raise prices to reduce consumption to increase unemployment and business depression.

CHARLES P. KRAFT

Columbus, Ohio.

Cruelty in India

Circumstantial Reports of Police Brutality Toward Nationalists

To the Editor of the Republican:

Americans interested in India are chafing under the close British censorship maintained over the news from that country. It extends to letters as well as newspapers. Even a report to the Labor party was taken out of the mail. The rulers of India, like the rulers of the Kentucky coal fields, are unwilling that the outside world should know what is going on there. In both cases the natural inference is that they have reason to fear the light.

Yet occasionally some news slips through. Lately a young English missionary named Reynolds made his way from the Northwest province to protest to the viceroy against the barbarities committed by the troops—such, he said, as almost made one "ashamed of being an Englishman." According to him, their method is to raid the villages in the dead of night, beat up all the villagers, strip them of their clothing and burn it, and burn down the Nationalist headquarters.

Peter Freeman, former member of Parliament, has also sent in a protest. He writes: "I was going along the main street of Madras today, when I saw about a dozen Indians walking quietly along, one carrying a flag. They were members of the Congress. Such action is illegal in India, so when they reached a policeman the flag was taken out of his hand, and without further ado the police officer started hitting him repeatedly with a heavy lathi (bludgeon) as hard as he could hit, on every part of his body, including many blows on his head.

"The man was knocked down and became unconscious after a short time, but the rain of blows continued even while he lay helpless on the ground. By this time a carload of about 20 additional police had arrived, all armed with heavy lathis. Other members of the little group were then attacked and beaten mercilessly, but without any retaliation or counter attack.

"To their shame, four English sergeants were present, and rather encouraged than otherwise this treatment of untried, harmless citizens. If they had committed an illegal act, they could have been arrested, tried and, if guilty, whatever punishment was necessary properly administered by the proper authority. But for the police to have the power to take the law into their own hands and use such cruel and brutal methods is a denial of every sense of justice and fair play which is the backbone of English tradition and humanity. Such sights are unfortunately of almost daily occurrence in every large town throughout India. No fair reports of such cases are permitted in any newspaper."

Women are beaten, too. Verrier Elwin, a Christian missionary in India, speaks of the remarkable courage shown by the women: "A huge procession of 1,500 women walked quietly through the streets of Borsad to receive without fear or retaliation an assault of beating and abuse from the police. Their leader, covered with her blood-stained garments, walked bravely on, repeating the holy name of God, to receive still further blows."

Comdr. J. M. Kenworthy, vice-president of the Air League of the British Empire, and former member of Parliament, says in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of the 3rd:

"The jails are full to overflowing, and special compounds for prisoners have been established, where those held during the pleasure of his majesty's government live in tents behind barbed wire. Even Miss Madline Slade, the gently-nurtured daughter of a British admiral, whom I know personally, is held in jail. This poor girl is utterly incapable of any violent act. The real terrorism in India is the oppression by the native police, with their British officers. These unfortunate public servants are goaded into acts of ever-increasing violence and pugnacity."

And he predicts that "this policy of ruthless suppression" will finally cause "the end of British imperialism in India."

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.
—The Springfield Republican.

National Religion and Labor Foundation

Non-Sectarian, Non-Denominational
1807 Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut

There is an impelling need for translating religion into the economic life of the nation. This movement, founded by Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, is a radical and fearless crusade for economic justice.

Although not organized on identical lines, it would attempt to do in the industrial and economic field something of the work that the National Council for the Prevention of War does in the peace field.

Activities

1. A monthly **Bulletin** would be issued, describing concretely, what religious institutions and individuals have done and are doing to help labor and the unemployed, including the detailed steps taken. The right of the workers to organize would be vigorously supported.

2. Round table conferences would be arranged in key communities, in which employers, labor leaders, and representatives of the public would discuss the problem of securing economic justice. Conferences for young people would be arranged with the prophetic leaders of America to consider the translation of religious and social justice into the community life.

3. Cooperative efforts with other organizations would be made to recruit students for actual industrial experience during the summer months. This might involve aid in industrial conflicts for economic justice. All of the students would be brought together at the end of the summer for a conference summarizing their experience.

4. Wherever other organizations were unable to make investigations, research on labor conditions might be undertaken and published, as, for example, a study of the extent to which unions are actually debarred in certain communities, or an analysis of the religious press to determine its attitude toward labor.

5. The Executive Secretaries would stand ready to assist the religious forces in any community to cooperate more effectively with labor in securing economic justice, through speakers, conferences, and other means.

6. Information on labor policies and treatment of workers would be collected, and furnished to individuals and to institutions which were interested in the intelligent investment of funds in humanized industries.

7. Educational campaigns would be conducted to acquaint people with progressive experiments in the field of industry and labor.

8. Whenever the movement discovered a genuine case of a religious leader who had lost his position because of activity on behalf of labor or social justice, the facts would be investigated and published.

9. Scholarships would be secured for Brookwood Labor College and other workers' educational enterprises.

10. A loan library would be maintained, containing periodicals and books on economic questions, to be sent to religious leaders free.

Send for a copy of

The New Humanist

for September-October, 1932

THE LOGIC OF HUMANISM
by Wilfred Payne

CANCER AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY
by Dudley D. Zuver

RUSSIA AND THE PARTNERSHIP OF YOUTH
by Brent Dow Allinson

RELIGIOUS BEHAVIOR VS. RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE
by Clare Burri

A REJOINDER TO DR. HAYDON'S REPLY
by Norman B. Johnson

EDITORIALS

A Humanist Extension Bureau

The Coming Election

SPECIAL

The New Humanist will be sent for one year together with a copy of Joseph Walker's "Humanism as a Way of Life" for $1.75.

Subscription yearly $1.00, single copy 20c.

THE NEW HUMANIST

14 West 1st Street, Dayton, Ohio